



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,786	11/18/2003	Steve JungHyun Hong	MV03-004	4565

7590 04/15/2008
Michael B. Atlass
Unisys Corporation
Unisys Way, MS/E8-114
Blue Bell, PA 19424-0001

EXAMINER

WOOD, WILLIAM H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2193

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/715,786	Applicant(s) HONG ET AL.	
	Examiner William H. Wood	Art Unit 2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20 are pending and have been examined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 26 March 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 9 recites software *per se* as the system components are merely software (a system comprising two software modules). Software itself is non-statutory. The claims provide no hardware to implement the software.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Microsoft** TechNet's, "Best Practices for Managing Applications with Process Control". The rejections are maintained as indicated by Examiner Roche in the previous office action, except as noted below.

Claims 1 and 14

Microsoft does not explicitly state dynamically managing the affinity mask for the application group by adding and removing processors from the affinity mask using priority values for the grouped install software application. Though, the reference does state dynamically managing the affinity mask for the application group by adding and removing processors from the affinity mask (*page 2, third bulleted item; page 16, "Managing Affinity for Process Groups", bottom of page; "you can use the only one and first in the row CPU for the processes and then dynamically add the second CPU if needed"*) and assigning priority values for the grouped install software application (*page 21, "Maintaining Nominal Performance for a Process Group", middle of page, "to set*

*up normal priority for the processes and then increase the priority if needed";
page 2, fourth bulleted item).*

Microsoft demonstrated that it was known at the time of invention to manage the affinity mask based upon need (page 16, "Managing Affinity for Process Groups", bottom of page; "you can use the only one and first in the row CPU for the processes and then dynamically add the second CPU if needed") and the reference indicated a desire to manipulate based upon maintaining performance criteria (page 21, section "Maintaining Nominal Performance for a Process Group"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to manage the affinity mask of **Microsoft** using priority values disclosed by **Microsoft**'s teaching. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide management services based upon need and performance to the processes if highest importance or need, which is clearly indicated by priority.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 26 March 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant further argues registry keys are not searched. However, as Applicant states, **Microsoft** uses the registry which

Art Unit: 2193

thus includes the registry keys. The rejections are therefore maintained as indicated.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Wood whose telephone number is (571)-272-3736. The examiner can normally be reached 10:00am - 4:00pm Tuesday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis A. Bullock Jr. can be reached on (571)-272-3759. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)273-8300 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR systems, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. For questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

/William H. Wood/
William H. Wood
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2193
April 15, 2008